

District Construction Engineer's Meeting

June 25 , 2010 8:30 AM

Video Conference

Attendees:

D1 – Jon Sands, Terry Muse, Scott Presson
D2 – Tim Ruelke, Michael Sandow
D3 – Keith Hinson, Renae Sanders, Ray Hodges
D4 – Pete Nissen, Pat McCann, John Danielson, Alberto Sardinas
D5 – Frank O'Dea, Lori Wilson, Jennifer Taylor, Jonathan Duazo
D6 – Mario Cabrera
D7 – Brian McKishnie, Conrad Campbell, Brian Pickard
TP – Matt Price, Bill Sears, Karen Akers, Kurt Stone
CO- David Sadler, Paul Steinman, Jerry Rudd, Stefanie Maxwell, Alan Autry, Nancy Aliff, Calvin Johnson, Greg Jones

Old Business & Updates from the February 2010 Meeting

1. Method of Calculating Embankment and Excavation (Frank O'Dea)
D5 design asked DCE's & SCO to discuss definition and classification of "Original Ground line". Need to consistently identify the original ground line the same for existing concrete pavements and asphalt pavement areas. SCO (David Chason) will look into this further based on the below email from D5.

Update: David Chason is currently working on examples to share with David Sadler.

2. Manufacturer Field Rep on Bridge Joint Installations (Pete Nissen)
Discussed requiring a field representative be on site when these items (modular joints) are installed. Central Office Design and Specifications does not support requiring this via a TSP, SP or Standard Specification. SCO (Steve Plotkin) will discuss this with Central Office Design/Specifications and provide an update to DCE's.

UPDATE: *Alberto Sardinas & John Danielsen shared a brief history of this issue with the group and provided an update on the development of the D4 TSP which will require manufacturers' representatives be on site when bridge joints are installed. The initial draft of the TSP has been developed and sent to various district disciplines and local industry representatives for review. Comments as a result of this review have been received and are being addressed by the district. Mr. Sadler suggested D4 send a draft version of the TSP to Paul Steinman who will submit it to the DCE group for review & comment.*

3. Arithmetic Mean Update (Paul Steinman)

UPDATE: David Chason is working with D3 and has identified a project which starts in April where the cores will be measured in the field to obtain the information requested. This project is scheduled to last until the end of this year. David plans to compare all three methods.

1. In accordance with the contract.
2. Cores
3. Overall

This project only has one lift of structural course. David will identify another project to evaluate.

DCE's suggested SCO analyze a broader range of projects prior to making any final determinations. D5 has/will submit a project(s) as part of the analysis. Update: D5 to submit project information to David Chason. This information has been submitted. David Chason is gathering additional information from D3 project(s), will analyze the data and submit a proposal to Mr. Sadler.

4. (Lorie Wilson) The new specification on Signals 611-2.3.3 requires that we hold 15% retainage for as-builts. Also the proposed 104-6.6 specification as currently written and under review states that final payment is to be withheld until the as-builts are received. Our question is, how is this being implemented statewide? It is cumbersome when you hold 15% on each item. . What final payment, what if the contractor is in the negative?

Site Manager processes for handling this on each signalization is cumbersome on district staff. Polled Districts to determine how this is being handled. Industry (via LESS committee) requested this be reduced to 5%. Industry claims these are being submitted monthly and then timely upon final acceptance. Discussed alternate proposals to withhold payment or qualifications (perhaps part of 9-8 submittals). SCO (Stefanie Maxwell & Larry Ritchie) will review with Central Office Legal and will provide an update to the DCE group.

Proposed specification change to 9-8 has been developed and is being evaluated by SCO. This proposed specification change will also require changes to other specifications (104, 555, 556, 557 & 611) if approved.

Update: the proposed specification changes have been submitted to the Specifications Office and are currently posted for Industry review. Potential implementation is January 2011.

5. Fuel & Bit counts against FTC time & money measures – any way to change that? (Pete Nissen)
The group discussed these potential built in performance measure impacts. Districts would like consistency with numbers reported to FTC annually, Executive Directors monthly, etc. SCO will review and discuss this further. Each DCE is to summarize specific examples and send them to Paul Steinman.

UPDATE: DCE's need to provide this information to Paul. *Update: This has been brought up to the FTC previously and they want the fuel & bit to remain in the report.*

The group discussed current methodology used to develop the annual FTC report vs. the methodology used to develop monthly reports provided to the Executive Board. It was suggested that SCO (Doug Martin) follow-up with Keith Hinson (D3) for a detailed explanation of the differences between these reporting methods.

The FTC report is a cumulative report that pulls contracts that have reached passed status within the current fiscal year. The Executive Board report pulls contracts that are in a current status of conditional acceptance, final acceptance or material certification. DCE's requested SCO explore the merits of adding the fuel/bituminous adjustments to the monthly executive report. Brian McKishnie & Keith Hinson discussed other specific differences between the reports. Alan Autry will schedule a teleconference with David Sadler, Paul Steinman, Doug Martin, Keith Hinson and Brian McKishnie to discuss this issue in greater detail.

6. Modified Special Provision on thermoplastic placement. 30 day cure versus 14 day cure (Brian McKishnie)

Discussed consistency of thermoplastic cure periods among the districts. Districts should gather and provide data to demonstrate whether or not tracking issues occur when a 14 day cure period is used (audible and standard thermo should be observed). Some districts currently place thermo via construction contracts while other districts placing thermo via maintenance contracts.

UPDATE: Districts need to provide this information if a change is to be made. SCO (Stefanie Maxwell) is currently drafting a Value Added Pavement Marking Developmental Specification.

Update: SCO is evaluating whether or not to move forward with a Value Added Dev Spec for pavement markings. D3 recently processed a specification change to allow a 14 day cure on a project. The results were submitted to Stefanie Maxwell, analyzed and determined to be favorable. The other districts were encouraged to select projects, request and receive approval from SCO to perform similar test projects.

7. Jon Sands 10-28-09 e-mail forwarded on 10-29-09.

Return receipt e-mails - Can this be used as a method of documentation delivery in lieu of Certified Mail? SCO will discuss with Central Office Legal to obtain a determination on this proposal.

SCO (Alan Autry) will review CPAM and other (Prep & Doc Manual) requirements to determine which letters must be sent via certified mail and update those documents accordingly.

Update: Prep & Doc chapter 3 (figure 3-3 – NTP) has been updated to remove the certified mail requirement. Prep & Doc chapter 8.6 will be updated to remove the certified mail requirement. Wage Rate Non-compliance (CPAM 5.4), Unpaid Bills (CPAM 6.1), Contractor Delinquency (CPAM 8.5.5), and Contractor Non-responsibility (CPAM 8.7.4) will continue to be sent certified mail.

8. DBE Reporting (Paul Steinman/Lorie Wilson) –

The group discussed current methodology used to develop the DBE reporting calculations as reported at the monthly Executive meetings. Districts are experiencing difficulty confirming the calculations which are being reported on a monthly basis. SCO (David Sadler/Kim Smith) will coordinate with Art Wright and Joseph Salib so that the methodology being used can be clearly understood and conveyed to district personnel.

It was discussed that since the previous DCE meeting changes have occurred in the DBE reporting methodology and department personnel. The DCE's were encouraged to provide SCO with feedback based on the next reporting period.

9. Proposed Changes to D/B Boilerplate RFP (Paul Steinman/Frank O'Dea)-

Update: The ACTT discussed proposed changes to the boilerplate RFP document in Section VI Design and Construction Criteria subsection C. Utility Coordination as shown above. It was decided to modify items 2 and 5 so as to incorporate the modifications to item 7 and proposed item 13. Central Office (SCO) has updated the boilerplate RFP documents posted on the SCO website to incorporate these changes as follows:

1. Ensuring that Utility Coordination and design is conducted in accordance with the Department's standards, policies, procedures, and design criteria.
2. Assisting the engineer of record in identifying all existing utilities and coordinating any new installations. **Reviewing proposed utility permit application packages and recommending approval/disapproval of each permit application based on the compatibility of the permit as related to the Design/Build firm's plans.**
3. Scheduling utility meetings, keeping and distribution of minutes of all utility meetings, and ensuring expedient follow-up on all unresolved issues.
4. Distributing all plans, conflict matrixes and changes to affected utility owners and making sure this information is properly coordinated.
5. Identifying and coordinating the completion of any Department or utility owner agreement that is required for reimbursement, or accommodation of the utility facilities associated with the Design/Build project. **Reviewing, approving, signing and coordination of all Utility Work Schedules.**
6. Assisting the Engineer Of Record and the contractor with resolving utility conflicts.

7. Handling reimbursable issues inclusive of betterment and salvage determination.
8. Obtaining and maintaining Sunshine State One Call Design to Dig Tickets.
9. QA Review of construction plans prior to construction activities for completeness
10. Acquisition/procurement of any required easements when stated in RFP and as required by design
11. Periodic project updates to the district utility office as needed.

10. Including Time Value Cost as part of selection formula on Adjusted Score D-B projects which do not include Incentive/Disincentive Provisions (David Sadler/Alan Autry)

Update: On federally funded projects the use of Time Value Costs should not be included in the final selection formula when I/D provisions are not included as part of the D-B project requirements. Central Office (SCO) will evaluate district approaches to using TVC w/out I/D on a case by case basis for State Funded projects only. When submitting such requests, the districts should provide documentation which supports the TVC and in no case should the TVC exceed the liquidated damage rate established by the contract.

11. CTQP Technician “strikes” for non-testing issues (David Sadler/Jim Musselman) – The following email is provided for review prior to the meeting:

The group discussed a proposal being developed by the State Materials Office. Mr. Sadler shared with the group that the Construction Training and Qualification Manual (CTQM) is currently being reviewed and a revision to this manual will be developed to address this process. The DCE’s requested to be notified when technician errors/oversights occur.

Update: Yvonne Collins and Jim Musselman are working on proposed changes to this process as well as changes to the CTQM. The DCE’s requested that before any changes are implemented, they be provided an opportunity to review those changes.

12. Proposed Change to 4-3.1 (Brian McKishnie) – The email and document at the link below are provided for review prior to the meeting:

The group reviewed and discussed a proposed specification change. Central Office Legal (Greg Jones) will review the proposed specification change and provide comments to SCO.

Update: A draft specification change was submitted to Greg Jones following the February meeting. Mr. Jones reviewed and modified the draft version. The version which included those changes was shared with the DCE group during the video conference and distributed to the DCE’s following the meeting. The DCE’s are to review the proposed draft and provide any comments to Alan Autry.

13. Laser v. Straightedge – Acceptance & Warranty (Pete Nissen) – The email below is provided for review prior to the meeting:

The group discussed current and proposed specifications which govern this issue. The Pavement Smoothness Committee will be discussing this issue at their next meeting and an update as a result of those discussions will be provided to the group.

Update: This will be further discussed during the Pavement Smoothness Committee in July. Each district was asked if they required contractors to repair straightedge deficiencies identified by the rolling straight edge prior to initiating the laser profiler testing.

14. FDOT responses to FHWA Evaluation & Process Review of CEI Services and Responsible Charge (Jerry Rudd) – *The group reviewed and discussed FHWA's CEI Services and Responsible Charge Evaluation and Process Review. The DCE's are to review this report and FDOT's responses with district personnel. Proposed changes to CPAM 7.3, which currently requires a review by district legal of all SA documentation prior to funds encumbrance and issuance of the NTP associated with the SA, and CPAM 7.4, which currently requires that Work Orders be fully executed prior to the department directing the contractor to proceed with work covered by the WO, were also discussed which derived from a review of this report. SCO (Alan Autry) will review those chapters of CPAM and revise each accordingly.*

Update: CPAM 7.3 has been revised to remove the legal review requirement prior to funds encumbrance. CPAM 7.4 has been revised to add a requirement that project staff issue a NTP prior to the contractor beginning work associated with a Work Order and remove the requirement that Work Orders be fully executed prior to the contractor performing work associated with a Work Order (provided the PA has confirmed there are sufficient funds remaining in the contingency item to cover the cost of the work).

As a result of additional discussions during the meeting, SCO (Alan Autry) will review the Work Order form and possibly make a modification which will indicate that if a separate NTP has not been issued, the executed Work Order will serve as the NTP. This will address those instances where the Work Order is executed prior to the contractor beginning work covered by the Work Order and will alleviate the requirement for project staff to issue a separate NTP when this occurs.

15. Streamline Contracts (Frank O'Dea) – The email below is provided for review prior to the meeting:
Mr. O'Dea provided the group with an update on D5's use of streamline contracting on specific pilot projects over the past few years. The DCE's were reminded that the use of Streamline Contracting Special Provisions will be a mandatory requirement on all projects (State & Federal) with an original contract amount less than \$2M and those project which include less than 2,000 tons of asphalt. The DCE's requested that the SP's be provided to them so they can review and discuss these SP's with project personnel. (The list of SP's was provided to the DCE's on 2/25/2010 by Alan Autry). Mr. O'Dea followed up with a powerpoint presentation developed by D5 which highlights the requirements of the Streamline SP's. SCO (David Chason & Richard Massey) will coordinate with D5 and develop a training to be shared with all districts specific to the administration requirements associated with Streamline Contracting. This training is scheduled to occur in mid to late Summer 2010 so that project personnel will be aware of the administrative requirements prior to projects getting underway.

Update: Training occurred in June 2010.

During the meeting Mr. O'Dea was asked to share a brief history of the streamline contracting concept for the benefit of those in attendance unfamiliar with the streamline contracting process. The modifications to sections 9-8 as part of the streamline contracts were discussed.

16. A Final Inspection & Acceptance Form Signature (David Sadler)

The districts were reminded that delegation of this form to an Operations Center Engineer or Resident Engineer shall not occur. The DCE's requested the form be modified to include the District Construction Engineer title in the appropriate location on the form. SCO (Alan Autry) will coordinate this revision to the form.

Update: The FIA form has been revised as requested.

17. Bonus/incentive payment approval process for FHWA full oversight and delegated projects (Chad Thompson – FHWA)

The districts were reminded to coordinate with the FHWA Transportation Engineer prior to programming, encumbering and/or paying bonus or incentive monies on FHWA Full-oversight projects. SCO (Alan Autry) will add this requirement to CPAM.

Update: This requirement has been added to CPAM 1.2 and 5.7.

18. Can SCO provide a status on when CPPR Category 6 will be modified? (Terry Muse)

The revised CPPR category has been submitted to Mr. Sadler for review and comment by Steve Plotkin. Mr. Sadler will finalize his review and send the draft document to the DCE's for review prior to finalization and implementation.

Update: The proposed changes are still under review by Mr. Sadler.

19. Can Site Manager or CIM be modified to include the Current Interim CPPR Grade? Currently only the final CPPR grade is entered in Site Manager. (Terry Muse)

The group discussed proposed modifications to SiteManager which would allow for interim CPPR grades to be entered and added to the ADHOC reporting feature. SCO (Doug Martin) will coordinate this proposed modification for implementation.

Update: A module is being added to the CIM site that will replace the current excel spreadsheet used to calculate interim & final grades. This project is currently underway and should be complete by mid July.

20. Use of Traffic Control Officers (Tim Ruelke) – The following is provided for review prior to the meeting:

The group discussed current specifications and indices which govern the utilization of TCO's and when it is appropriate for FDOT to compensate the contractor for their utilization. Payment should only be made when TCO's are utilized in accordance with the index (overhead operations only) and as defined in specification 102. Payment should not be made when the contractors means & methods require utilization of TCO's. SCO (Stefanie Maxwell) will review current specifications to determine if a specification change is necessary to clarify appropriate payment.

Update: SCO is proposing the following change to Article 102-7 to help clarify when to pay for traffic control officers. We plan to implement this in January 2011. The proposed specification change should be out for review within the next few weeks.

102-7 Traffic Control Officer.

Provide uniformed law enforcement officers, including marked law enforcement vehicles, to assist in controlling and directing traffic in the work zone when the following types of work is necessary on projects:

1. Traffic control in a signalized intersection when signals are not in use.
2. When Standard Index No. 619 is used on Interstate at nighttime and called for in the plans.
3. When traffic pacing is used for overhead work in accordance with Standard Index 655.
4. When pulling conductor/cable above an open traffic lane on limited access facilities, when called for in the plans or approved by the Engineer.

New Business

1. Asphalt Straightedge Deficiencies left in place at full or partial pay (Steve Benak/David Sadler)

From: Sadler, David A

Sent: Wednesday, April 07, 2010 8:58 AM

To: Benak, Steve

Subject: RE: Need guidance concerning Asphalt Straightedge Deficiencies left in place at full pay or partial pay

Steve,

The PA has been given authority via CPAM to waive straightedge corrections/penalties for deficiencies are caused by manholes, valve boxes, intersections, etc. that are beyond control of the Contractor. Straightedge deficiencies beyond these would require SCO approval.

Let's discuss as a DCE topic expansion of waiver areas to include tapers, begin/end of project/bridges.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

David A. Sadler, P.E.

From: Benak, Steve

Sent: Wednesday, April 07, 2010 8:12 AM

To: Sadler, David A

Subject: FW: Need guidance concerning Asphalt Straightedge Deficiencies left in place at full pay or partial pay

Dave, These are areas we are excepting out due to 330-12.4.5.2 as NON-objectionable . Or do you want all of these sent to you for approval?

If we have a mainline deficiency that we want to leave in at partial or full pay , then we will go through the approval process.

The districts asked for clarification as to when SCO approval must be obtained for straightedge deficiencies which will be left in place at full or partial pay (Refer to Specification 330-12.4.5 & CPAM 11.2.5). Request by a contractor to leave in place at full or partial pay any straightedge deficiency in excess of 3/16" discovered in mainline pavement shall be submitted to SCO for review and approval. Straightedge deficiencies discovered in the following areas described in Specification 330-12.4.5.2 may be left in place at full or partial pay after approval is obtained from both the DBE and DCE:

- shoulders
- intersections
- tapers
- crossovers
- parking lots
- turnlanes less than 250 feet in length
- acceleration lanes less than 250 feet in length
- deceleration lanes less than 250 feet in length
- side streets less than 250 feet in length
- transverse joints at the beginning and end of the project where the deficiency is determined to be beyond the control of the contractor
- transverse joints at the beginning and end of bridge structures where the deficiency is determined to be beyond the control of the contractor
- ramps where the geometric orientation of the pavement results in an inaccurate measurement with the rolling straightedge
- superelevated sections where the geometric orientation of the pavement results in an inaccurate measurement with the rolling straightedge

SCO will review CPAM 11.2.5 to determine if additional information/clarification should be included.

2. SCO Process Review of SiteManager Data – David/Paul

The districts were advised that as a part of the 2010/2011 Process Reviews conducted by SCO, specific reviews of SiteManager data entry will be performed. This will insure that information entered into SiteManager at the district level is as accurate and current as possible. Recently there have been instances where data derived from SiteManager and used as the basis of reporting has been determined to be inaccurate or non-existent. It is expected that these reviews will minimize and/or prevent this from occurring in the future.

3. General Counsel Review of SA's >\$150K – Paul/Greg Jones

The Office of General Counsel has implemented a process change whereby all SA's or UP's in excess of \$150K will be reviewed by the respective Special Counsel for Construction. It was discussed that since this appears to be a temporary departure from standard procedures, no changes to CPAM 7.3 will be made. Central Office Representatives from the Office of General Counsel will coordinated this process change with District Representative from the Office of General Counsel.

4. QAR Monitoring Plans – Pete Nissen

Pete asked for an update on the QAR Monitoring Plan information submitted recently by each district. David Sadler stated the all of the information provided by the districts had been received, reviewed, compiled with additional information provided by SCO and submitted to department executives as requested. At this time, no additional action is required by SCO or the districts.

5. Delineate business drive entrances on urban project – Paul Steinman

A potential research project being developed by D5 was discussed. Below is the link to a presentation developed by D5.

<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/Construction/Publications/MeetingMinutes/DCE/2010/JuneAttach/DelineationOfBusinessEntrances.pdf>

Other districts were asked if this issue has been a major concern on active construction projects. No major concerns were expressed during the meeting.

6. Non-uniform concrete mixtures for miscellaneous drilled shafts – Tim Ruelke

Tim provided a history of recent events experienced in District 2 which led to the rejection of concrete on the basis of Specification 346-6.2. The other districts were asked to poll project personnel to determine if concrete had been rejected on the basis of this specification and report these results back to David Sadler no later than July 9, 2010. A concerned was raised that project personnel have allowed screening of concrete to remove non-uniform mix. SCO is of the position that this screening process, if being used, should be discontinued. SCO's expectation is for concrete producers to provide mix in compliance with the specification requirements.

7. Recording Pre-construction Meetings – David Sadler/Paul Steinman

Currently CPAM 3.1 requires that pre-construction conferences be recorded (audio or video). A recent statute change related to public meetings was discussed as it relates to these and other meetings typically recorded by district or project staff. Recently Paul Steinman asked the DCE group for a list of meetings that the districts would like to continue to record. The meeting list, as it relates to the statute change, is currently under review. As additional guidance or policy changes are developed as a result of this review, these guidance/changes will be shared with the DCE's. Refer to Paul Steinman's e-mail of 5/18/2010.

8. EPA Fly-ash Proposal – Rafiq Darji

Rafiq shared the presentation at the link below with the group.

http://www.dot.state.fl.us/Construction/Publications/MeetingMinutes/DCE/2010/JuneAttach/CCR_Webinar_DCE_Mtg062510.pdf

9. Storage of “unused” construction signs – Rafiq Darji

During project reviews, FHWA has noted several instances of contractors storing construction signs which are not in use (typically those signs used to advise motorists of lane closures) along the grassed or paved shoulders of the roadway within the limits of the clear zone. Project personnel are reminded to insure that when such signs are not in use, they should not be stored within clear zone limits.

10. Thermoplastic Material Supply – Brian McKishnie

Currently no information has been provided to substantiate an industry wide shortage. The districts along with SCO will continue to monitor this situation. If/when any industry wide shortage is substantiated, SCO will provide additional guidance/direction. If the districts receive any additional information, they are requested to submit this information to SCO. Please refer to Paul Steinman's e-mail of 5/20/2010.

11. FSU Customer Service Surveys – Brian McKishnie

FSU has received and is compiling the results of surveys submitted earlier this year. One survey is being resubmitted due to the inclusion of erroneous information (incorrect project location map included as part of the original survey). Once the results of this survey are received and the final report is developed, SCO will share this information with the districts.

12. Clarification of Intent of CPAM 7.4.6.2 – Scott Presson

Here is an item that Jon/Terry/I would like to discuss at the DCE Meeting:

Clarification of Intent of [CPAM 7.4.6.2](#).

Does this guidance also allow Project Teams to direct Contractor's to perform the work based on certification of availability of funds in an executed contingency when the Department may be liable for delays? Funding for the unilateral payment is available, only the Function Code/Work Activity must be changed.

Example Scenario: An issue is discovered on the project, requiring extra work from the Contractor and causing immediate delays in which the Department may be liable. Project Team's Engineer's Estimate supports entitlement for time and money to the Contractor. However, Contractor delays negotiations in an attempt to catch up on self-imposed previous delays or requires an extended amount of time to determine estimated costs.

Can the Project Team direct the Contractor to perform the work to avoid delays based on availability of funds in the executed contingency, or must the Project Team wait for the encumbrance of funds for the work to be approved by the Comptroller? Waiting on the encumbrance would result in delays and further costs.

CPAM 7.4.6.2 was reviewed and discussed. The intent of this section is to provide project personnel with the ability to utilize available contingency funding, which would otherwise be reserved for Work Orders, as a method of funding work which will be covered by a Unilateral Payment document. Utilizing this process can potentially reduce delays which may be encountered during the funds encumbrance process. It was discussed that this process is very rarely used since the process to switch the funding sources later is cumbersome. Since CPAM 7.3.12 prohibits paying for work covered by a Unilateral Payment document until such time as all work is complete to the satisfaction of the department and due to recent changes to CPAM 7.4 (see follow-up item 14 above), SCO (Alan Autry) will review CPAM 7.4.6.2 to determine if it should be modified.

13. SA Recoverable Costs (SB 2386) – Scott Presson

From: Sands, Jon

Sent: Tuesday, June 15, 2010 8:02 PM

To: Presson, Scott

Cc: Miracola, Karen; Childs, Walter; Whitt, Jerrold R; Mercer, Raymond; Beagles, Gary; Faison, John; Muse, Terry; Douberley, Marshall; Masing, Bernie A; Chupka, Frank

Subject: SA Recoverable Cost spreadsheet information and update request

Scott,

Can you and Marshall assist Utilities on the remaining SA items referenced in the e-mail below.

Also, can you forward this issue to Alan Autry for discussion at the DCE Meeting of the yellow highlighted paragraphs below concerning Senate Bill 2386. Can SCO research this issue and provide us direction and/or update CPAM.

Thanks,

Jonathan M. Sands, P.E.

From: Kirchgessner, Bonnie

Sent: Tuesday, June 15, 2010 11:58 AM

To: Miracola, Karen; Whitt, Jerrold R; Mercer, Raymond; Beagles, Gary; Faison, John

Cc: Childs, Walter; Sands, Jon; Brookshire, Linda; Kowalski, Joe; Small, Charmaine

Subject: SA Recoverable Cost spreadsheet information and update request

After reviewing the responses provided on the Supplemental Agreements Recoverable Cost spreadsheet there are items without comments, with unanswered questions or that require additional information. The items for your district that still need to be addressed are highlighted in yellow on the attached spreadsheet. Please respond to each highlighted item and return to me by June 22, 2010.

During the past Legislative Session, Senate Bill 2386 (Financial Matters) was passed which includes new reporting requirements for all receivables due to the State. This bill includes language that now requires all agency's to turn over their accounts receivables to the DFS collection agency within 120 days after the payment is due. This bill also requires each agency to submit a report beginning October 1, 2010 on their accounts receivables. With the new Legislative changes it is very important that we effectively identify and manage these receivables.

Since it is the OOC-GAO, Accounts Receivable and Locally Funded Agreement Sections' responsibility to ensure that all funds owed to the Department are billed and collected timely and appropriately and that we are in compliance with the requirement in Senate Bill 2386, we will be asking for your assistance in providing periodic updates to the Supplemental Agreements Recoverable Cost spreadsheet.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me.

Respectfully

Bonnie Kirchgessner, LFA Coordinator

The above e-mail was discussed. It was determined by representatives from the Office of General Counsel that the information being requested should not be treated as "accounts receivable" at this time, therefore should not be impacted by SB 2386. Calvin Johnson and Greg Jones will coordinate with Bonnie Kirchgessner, LFA Coordinator so as to resolve this situation.

14. Measurement of Thermoplastic – Stefanie Maxwell

The districts were reminded of the thickness requirements for thermoplastic pavement markings (Specifications 711-4.2, 701-4.2 and 702-4.2), and that both the QC and VT personnel should measure the thickness of in place thermoplastic material & verify that thickness requirements are met. Recently, it has been discovered on several projects that thermoplastic installations have failed to meet the minimum thickness requirements. Projects with open graded friction course requires 120 to 130 mils or .120 to .130 inches of material in order to get 100 mils above the surface, as it has to fill the voids (and it does still drain). The thickness measurement above the surface is important to attain proper bead embedment; otherwise, the material fails prematurely. Scott Presson asked if the measurement should be taken prior to the placement of reflective beads. Stefanie responded that the measurement should be taken after placement of the beads but to adjust the gauges in an effort to avoid the beads as best as possible. Refer to FM 5-541.

15. Barrier Wall Mounted Construction Signs – Stefanie Maxwell

The districts were reminded that currently there is no approved method of mounting construction signs to barrier walls listed on the QPL. This is due to the fact that criteria have not been established to review products against. Until this issue is resolved Project Administrators will allow the use of these items in the field as long as the sign stay upright (wind) on the project and no excessive damage to barrier wall when mounted.

16. Two Reactive Component in lieu of Thermoplastic Material – Stefanie Maxwell

The districts were reminded that certain Two Reactive Component materials have been approved for use and are currently on the QPL. These materials serve as an alternative to thermoplastic materials provided project specifications include Specification 709. If the districts elect to utilize Two Reactive Component material (Section 709) in lieu of Thermoplastic material on projects, which are governed by Specification 711, a specification change request should be submitted to SCO in accordance with CPAM 7.3.6.3.

17. Suspension of Contractors Operations for Monday July 5 (Independence Day - Observed)

D4 asked for an interpretation from SCO as to the granting of holidays due to the suspensions of 8-6.4 when the holiday is observed on a day different from the day identified in the specification. Since the upcoming Independence Day holiday will not be observed on July 4 (Sunday) but will be observed on Monday, July 5, the districts should utilize the Independence Day observed date of July 5 as the basis for evaluating and granting the Holiday Time Extensions of 8-7.3.2. SCO (Alan Autry) will review 8-6.4 and if necessary develop a proposed specification change which will address this issue.

18. Sure-lock Pile Splices (Paul Steinman)

Paul advised the group of the recent purchase of the manufacturer of Sure-lock Pile Splices by a Canadian firm. This may impact our construction projects as they related to

Buy America provisions of our contracts. SCO will continue to monitor this situation and provide guidance/direction as necessary.

19. D/B Project Schedule of Values (David Sadler)

Industry has recently expressed concern that certain districts are requiring Schedule of Values in such detail that they mirror the CES information prepared by the department on Conventional Bid-Build projects. Project staff managing D-B projects are reminded to review the Schedule of Values posted on the SCO website. SoV's submitted by D-B firms should be compared to SCO document when being evaluated for acceptance.

20. Landscaping (David Sadler)

Project staff is reminded to enforce the inspection establishment provisions of Specification 580-3 and 580-5.

21. Finished Soil Layer (David Sadler)

Project staff is reminded to enforce provisions of Specification 987 (organic matter content and pH value).

22. Project Information Signs (David Sadler)

The use and implementation of Project Information Signs (Index 600) was discussed. The districts would like greater flexibility as it relates to when this sign is used on a project and proximity of the sign as it relates to the project location. Current requirements call for these signs to be installed on all projects with a duration of 90 days or more and the sign is to be placed 1-2 miles in advance of the project limits. The districts would like to utilize these signs based on project needs (i.e. potential impacts to motorist) and have the flexibility to place the sign closer to the physical limits of the project. SCO (Stefanie Maxwell) will coordinate any changes with the Roadway Design Office.

23. Litter Removal/Mowing Specifications – FHWA perspective

FHWA has determined that those pay items associated with Specification 107 *Litter Removal and Mowing* (effective July 2010) are routine maintenance items and should be coded as Federal Aid Non-participating on federalized construction projects.

24. DCE Monthly Update Meetings (Alan Autry)

These meetings are currently scheduled for the remainder of 2010 beginning July 19, 2010 and will be held via videoconference. The meeting frequency will be adjusted based on the volume of agenda items. For 2011 *GoToMeeting* may be utilized.

NEXT DCE MEETING – October 29 2010